

REMARKS

Claims 30-32 are pending; claims 30 and 31 are amended herein, and therefore claims 30-32 remain for consideration.

Claims 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Arnold (U.S. Pat. No. 4,662,803). The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested, particularly in view of the clarifying amendments to the claims.

Arnold is directed to a reamer which enlarges or shapes previously formed holes, but is not used to generate holes. The present invention, on the other hand, is directed to a rotary cutting tool for generating slots in die boards, as recited in independent claim 30. The claimed structure of the rotary cutting tool of the present invention is distinguishable from that of the reamer disclosed in Arnold because of, among other things, the different purposes for which these tools are used.

The reamer disclosed in Arnold defines unequally spaced flutes. As shown in Fig. 1, a small diameter, rear portion 18 of the reamer defines four helical cutting flutes 23, 24, 25 and 26 for performing the reaming function (see col. 2, lines 62-66). A relatively large diameter, cylindrical body 42 has a countersink cutter 44 for performing another type of cutting or countersink function. The cylindrical body 42 having the countersink cutter 44 is attached at a second end 22 of the rear portion 18 having the helical flutes (see, col. 3, lines 49-56). As shown in Fig. 1, the countersink cutter 44 defined on the cylindrical body 42 is not helical, but rather is aligned with the longitudinal axis of the reamer. There is no mention in Arnold of any flutes, helical or otherwise, along the constant diameter portion of the cylindrical body 42 that is used for countersinking. In other words, helical flutes are not defined on each of the cutting portions 18 and 42 of the reamer. The rotary cutting tool as recited in claim 30 of the present application, on the other hand, generally recites first and second non-tapered cutting portions each defined in part by at least two helical flutes extending longitudinally.

Moreover, Arnold does not teach or suggest a rotary cutting tool including a first cutting portion that is non-tapered and defining a first outer diameter, and a second cutting portion that is non-tapered and defining a second outer diameter

extending from and coaxial with the first cutting portion, as recited in amended independent claim 30 of the present application. Rather, Arnold shows a reamer that is tapered from forward end 27 to rearward end 22. Further, Arnold does not teach or suggest a rotary cutting tool including a tapered portion interposed between non-tapered first and second cutting portions, wherein the tapered portion has a diameter that progressively decreases from the first outer diameter to the second outer diameter, as recited in amended claim 31 of the present application.

From claim 31, it can be seen that the first cutting portion has a large diameter relative to the second cutting portion such that the second cutting portion generates a slot in a die board having a width adapted for receiving and grippingly retaining a die board rule, and the first cutting portion is larger in diameter relative to the second cutting portion to provide strength and stability to the rotary cutting tool during a cutting operation.

For an anticipation rejection to be appropriate, each and every element or limitation in a rejected claim must be disclosed in a single prior art reference used in the claim rejection. Because Arnold does not teach or suggest a first cutting portion that is non-tapered and defining a first outer diameter, and a second cutting portion that is non-tapered and defining a second outer diameter extending from and coaxial with the first cutting portion, as recited in amended independent claim 30, it cannot be maintained that claim 30 is anticipated by Arnold. Further, because Arnold does not teach or suggest a rotary cutting tool including first and second non-tapered cutting portions each defined in part by at least two helical flutes extending longitudinally, as generally recited in claim 30, it cannot be maintained that claim 30 is anticipated by Arnold.

Because claims 31 and 32 each depend from and thereby incorporate the limitations of claim 30, claims 31 and 32 are likewise deemed not anticipated by Arnold for at least the reasons set forth for claim 30.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 30-32 are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early action to that effect is earnestly solicited.

No fees or deficiencies in fees are believed to be owed. However, authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 13-0235 in the event any such fees are owed.

Respectfully submitted,

By *Daniel G. Mackas*
Daniel G. Mackas
Registration No. 38,541
Attorney for Applicants

McCormick, Paulding & Huber LLP
CityPlace II, 185 Asylum Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06103-3402
(860) 549-5290